

44

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,114	SUNTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gloria R. Weeks	3721	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gloria R. Weeks. (3) _____.

(2) Nomugi Tomoyori. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 June 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9, 14 and 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sandolo (USPN 5,361,560); Sandolo (USPN 5,690,283); Kammler et al. (USPN 5,832,700).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative, Attorney Tomoyori, presented the following issues: with respect to claims 9 & 14, whether Sandolo provides a measurer and whether the control means actually adjusts the flavoring supply; with respect to claim 20, whether the quantity of additive is adjusted based on the combined weight of the package. Examiner addressed how the "control means" limitation does not exclude the mechanical element (ie. valve or solenoid) of Sandolo. Both Examiner and Attorney Tomoyori discussed the possible amendment to include a limitation that presented the control means as an "automatic" adjuster, rather than a manual structure as disclosed by Sandolo. TQAS will be consulted regarding this specific proposed amendment. The respective limitation of claim 20, with respect to the adjustment of the additive, was found to be broad enough to be suggested by Sandolo.